

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	O. I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,537 05/26/2005		05/26/2005	Werner Anderson	ANDERSON ET AL-2 PCT	7089
25889	7590	03/07/2006		EXAMINER	
	M COLLA		MCMAHON, MARGUERITE J		
COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ROSLYN, NY 11576				3747	
				DATE MAIL ED: 03/07/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/536,537	ANDERSON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Marguerite J. McMahon	3747				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	J. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/5/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Claim Objections

Page 2

Claims 1-6 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and have many grammatical and idiomatic errors. Appropriate correction is required.

Note that the term "groove root" is not clearly defined. Note also that in claim 2 the language states that the lubrication groove lies parallel to the longitudinal axis of the pin bore, but in the Figures it appears that the lubrication groove lies perpendicular to the axis of the pin bore. In claims 4 and 5 the use of the term 10 and 3 to indicate degrees is not appropriate, and the terms should be changed to –10 degrees—and --3 degrees—respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galli (4,297,975). Galli shows the use of more than one groove 3 having a depth of less than 100 micrometers in each of two pin bosses 2, the grooves located in the center region of the pin bosses and running over the nadir region and the equator region of the pin bores and being inclines at a slant towards the inside and outside of the piston pin bore, and creating acute angles therewith. It would have been

Application/Control Number: 10/536,537 Page 3

Art Unit: 3747

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to choose a depth of between 40 and 60 micrometers, since a change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, and to employ an acute angle of less than 3 degrees, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marguerite J. McMahon whose telephone number is 703-308-1956. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yuen Henry can be reached on 703-308-1946. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

γ\γ\\ MARGUERITE MCMAHON PRIMARY EXAMINER